



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Finally, the question would naturally arise whether the Prākṛit dialects show tendencies of this same sort. I have examined this question in a somewhat superficial way, but do not feel like expressing an opinion. The matter of doubling of consonants in Prākṛit is much more confused than in Pāli, and requires a special study.

The tendency which I assume never acquired anything like universal prevalence in Pāli. But this cannot be counted as a disproof of the thesis. Pāli fonology is full of such tentative leads, never fully carried out.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON

University of Pennsylvania

On a possible Pre-Vedic Form in Pāli and Prākṛit

The Pāli-Prākṛit root *kaḍḍh*, 'draw', 'plow', is the lexical equivalent of Sanskrit *karṣ*, *krṣ*,¹ but cannot be derived from its presumptive source by any known fonetic process. Analogical infection, or blend with any other root does not suggest itself, the possibilities of that sort are not entirely precluded by mere negation. But it is possible to explain root *kaḍḍh* by an historical process of another kind.

The 'root-determinative' *d* attaches itself with great predilection in the Aryan tongues to roots ending in sibilants. Thus in Vedic the root *īḍ* = *iṣ-d*, from *iṣ* (*ichati*), for which see *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 1906, pp. 13 ff.²; *pīḍ* = *piṣ-d* (*JHUC*. l. c.) from *piṣ*, 'crush' (*πιέζω* has nothing to do with the case); *mīḍ*, from **mīḍ* = *miṣ-d* from *miṣ*, both in the sense of 'shut the eyes' (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* i. 221 ff.).

Some of those formations are Indo-Iranian, or even Indo-European: Avestan *khraoḍdaiti*, 'harden', *khruḍda*, 'hard'; Sanskrit *krūḍayati*, 'thicken', *kroḍas*, 'breast': Greek *κρυσ-ταίνω*, 'congeal'. Sanskrit *heḍ*, *hīḍ*, 'hate', Avestan *zoīḍda*, 'ugly', OHG. *geist* (cf. ON. *geisa* 'be infuriated'): Goth. *usgaisjan*, 'make beside one's self'. Especially as regards the sounds *ḍd*, preceded by *r*, cf. Aryan *mṛḍ*, in Sanskrit *mṛḍ*, Avestan *mərəḍd* 'pity', either from root *mṛṣ*, 'forget', or I.-E. *mṛḡ* 'wipe off'.

¹ Hemacandra 4. 187; the basis *kaḍḍh* is probably continued in the modern Hindu dialects; e. g., in Marāṭhī *kāḍhnem*; see Bloch, *Langue Marathe*, §§112, 231, and p. 308.

² Persistent identifications with Lat. *aestumo*; Goth. *aīstan*; OHG. *ēra*; or with Skt. *yajati* (*iṣṭa-*) are all wrong.

It seems hardly possible that Pāli-Prākṛit *kaḍḍh* does not contain this same additional *d* (*kṛṣ-d*, *kṛṣ-d*), tho there is no trace of it in Iranian and Vedic. The form should be Aryan *kṛṣd* (Avestan *kərəṣd*; Vedic *kṛṣ*). From this otherwise defunct Aryan *kṛṣd* the Pāli-Prākṛit *kaḍḍh* is derivable by impeccable fonetics. The assumption is daring but not impossible when we remember that the Middle-Indic dialects have certainly preserved some Vedic forms that are lost in Sanskrit; see Pischel, *Grammatik der Prākṛit-Sprachen*, §6 (with bibliografy).

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD

Johns Hopkins University

Gobryas, governor of Babylon

In *Revue d'assyriologie* II. 165 ff., Père Scheil published a letter from Erech, written by Anu-shar-uṣur to Nabû-mukîn-apli and Nabû-aḥ-iddin, in which reference is made to soldiers who are on the *lî'û* 'roll' of Nebuchadrezzar and Neriglissar; and the fact that the captain was anxious that the depleted ranks of these soldiers should not become known to Gubarû. From this Scheil concluded that Gobryas had already exercised a high command in the army at the time of Nebuchadrezzar. (See also King, *A History of Babylon*, p. 281.)

The mention of soldiers' 'rolls' of Nebuchadrezzar and of Neriglissar when Gobryas was in control would at once suggest that the time the letter was written was not in the time of Nebuchadrezzar, but when he was governor, in the reign of Cyrus; and from what follows this is shown to be correct.

In the writer's *Neo-Babylonian Letters from Erech* (YBT III) there is one, No. 45, in which the *lî'û* 'rolls' of Neriglissar and Nabonidus are referred to in connection with food for the soldiers of Cyrus. From what follows this was written in the same reign, namely that of Cyrus. See also No. 81, written by the same man. No. 106 also refers to the *lî-ê* of Nebuchadrezzar, Neriglissar, and Nabonidus, and was written by the same man, Innina-aḥê-iddin, but probably in the following reign because of the references to Cambyses (see line 34).

In Tremayne's *Records from Erech, Time of Cyrus and Cambyses* (YBT VII), which is ready for the press, the names of Nabû-mukîn-aplu and Nabû-aḥ-iddin, the two addressees in Scheil's tablet, frequently occur together as two officers, the former as the